

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

These remarks are submitted in response to the Office Action dated May 7, 2007 (hereinafter Office Action). As this response is timely filed within the 3-month shortened statutory period, no fee is believed due. However, the Office is expressly authorized to charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account 50-0951.

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,732,176 to Stewart, *et al.* (hereinafter Stewart '176), in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0096633 to Goldberg (hereinafter Goldberg), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,954,735 to Djupsjobacka, *et al.* (hereinafter Djupsjobacka). Claims 1, 5, 9, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,571,221 to Stewart (hereinafter Stewart '221), in view of Goldberg, and further in view of Djupsjobacka.

Amendments to the Claims

Although Applicants respectfully disagree with the claim rejections, Applicants have amended the claims to emphasize certain aspects of the invention and to expedite prosecution of the present application. It is expressly noted, however, that the amendments should not be interpreted as the surrender of any subject matter and Applicants reserve the right to present the original version of any of the amended claims in any future divisional or continuation applications from the present application.

In the response, Claims 1, 5, 9, and 13 have been amended to further emphasize certain aspects of the invention. In particular, Claims 1, 5, 9, and 13 have been amended to recite the limitation that in response to receiving a user request for an Application Service Provider service, the host computing system determines which components of the requested service are available locally and remotely. Furthermore, the claims have also been amended to include the limitation that any components available locally are immediately delivered or forwarded to the wireless device in the personal area network

(PAN), regardless of whether other components still need to be retrieved from remote Application Service Providers. Claims 10-12 have also been amended to maintain consistency among the claims.

The claim amendments are fully supported in the Specification (see, e.g., page 14, line 19, to page 15, line 2). No new matter has been added by these amendments.

The Claims Define Over the Cited References

As previously noted, independent Claims 1, 5, 9, and 13 were rejected as being unpatentable over the combination of Goldberg, Djupsjobacka, and either of Stewart '176 or Stewart '221. Furthermore, Goldberg is cited on page 5 as disclosing a plurality of services for users of wireless devices to select from. Djupsjobacka is cited on page 6 as disclosing selecting an Application Service Provider (ASP) service from a list of ASP services. The remaining elements of claims 1, 5, 9, and 13 are asserted in the Office Action to be disclosed in Stewart '176 or Stewart '221. Stewart '176 discloses a method and system for providing roaming users access to one or more remote networks. In particular, Stewart '176 discloses using a management information base (150) to route users connecting to a local network (130) to the appropriate network provider (160) to provide access to the internet. (See FIG. 1.) Stewart '221 also discloses using a management information base (150), but using it to authenticate users connecting to the network (130) prior to permitting access to a service provider (140).

Applicants respectfully submit that Stewart '176 and Stewart '221 (hereinafter Stewart References), separately or in combination with any other reference of record, fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of Claims 1, 5, 9, and 13, as amended. In particular, the Stewart References fail to disclose that components of an ASP service can be stored locally by the host computing system for immediate delivery or forwarding to a requesting wireless device. For example, Stewart '176 only discloses using the local memory storage (150) for storing information related to authentication and user access of

network resources. (See, e.g., Col. 8, lines 35-49.) Although Stewart '176 discloses that the memory storage (150) can be used to store data and programs, the memory storage is explicitly limited to the storage of needed information and programs for routing user requests. Nowhere does Stewart '176 disclose that the local memory storage (150) would be used to store any components of an ASP service which can be delivered to wireless users. Similarly, Stewart '221 only discloses using the local memory storage (150) for storing information related to user access, authentication, and billing related to network access. (See, e.g., Col. 10, line 11, to Col. 11, line 11.) Such a limitation is also not disclosed or suggested in Goldberg or Djupsjobacka.

In contrast, as recited in the claims, with Applicants' invention components of a requested ASP service can be stored locally. This provides a mechanism by which such components can be immediately delivered to wireless users upon request. Such a configuration allows the delivery of ASP services to proceed more quickly, as the host computing system is not required to wait until all components are locally available to transfer the ASP service to a wireless device. Such a configuration can allow the PAN to provide ASP services in a more efficient manner to multiple users. For example, in a PAN where certain ASP services are frequently requested, the host computing system need not access remote ASP's in order to retrieve components each time a user makes a request because such components can be stored locally. (See, e.g., Specification, page 14, line 19, to page 15, line 2.) This provides a more advantageous configuration than that disclosed in the Stewart References, where, although local storage can provide faster access to remote networks, the user would still have to wait for all components to be retrieved from remote locations.

Accordingly, the Stewart References, alone or in combination with any other reference of record, fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of Claims 1, 5, 9, and 13, as amended. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that amended Claims 1, 5, 9, and 13 define over the prior art. Furthermore, as each of the remaining claims

dependents from Claim 1, 5, 9, or 13 while reciting additional features, Applicants further respectfully submit that the remaining claims likewise define over the prior art.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. Applicants request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 20, 2007



Gregory A. Nelson, Registration No. 30,577
Richard A. Hinson, Registration No. 47,652
Eduardo Quinones, Registration No. 58,575
AKERMAN SENTERFITT
Customer No. 40987
Post Office Box 3188
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188
Telephone: (561) 653-500